

REMARKS

Applicant will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claim 11 for an informality therein. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 11 and deleted the word "circuit," as requested by the Examiner. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The Examiner also rejects Claim 10 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, it is believed that the Examiner objects to the recital of "the second subframe period" in line 8 from the bottom of Claim 10, as lacking antecedent basis. Therefore, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending this term in Claim 10 to recite "a second subframe period."

It is respectfully submitted that this overcomes the Examiner's objections, and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 2-5, 10, 11, 13 and 14

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2-5, 10, 11, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (US 6,333,515 - sic 6,222,515) in view of “applicant admitted prior art” (“AAPA”). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11. For example, independent Claim 2 has been amended to recite the additional feature of “wherein the voltage for the 0th gradation is for displaying black-display in a screen of the liquid crystal display device.” Claims 3, 10 and 11 have been amended in a similar manner. Hence, the device of Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 is normally-black mode.

In contrast, Yamaguchi is normally-white mode. Normally-black mode is also not taught in AAPA. Therefore, this claimed feature is not disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

Therefore, independent Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6-9 and 15-18

The Examiner also rejects Claims 6-9 and 15-18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. in view of AAPA and further in view of Katakura et al. (US 6,057,824). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 19

The Examiner also rejects Claims 16 and 19 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of AAPA and further in view of Mikami et al. (US 6,825,826). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, these dependent claims are also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is also adding new dependent Claims 25-28.

New Claim 25 recites the feature that the voltage for the 0th gradation is a reset signal. This feature is supported by, for example, page 9, lines 1-3 in the specification of the present application.

New Claims 26-28 recite the feature that a reset signal is supplied to the one of the subframes in the low-gradation voltage area of the picture screen, and no reset signal is supplied to the one of the subframes in areas other than the low-gradation voltage area

of the picture screen. This feature is supported by for example, page 9, lines 15-18 in the specification.

Hence, no new matter is being added.

As these are dependent claims, they are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this Amendment and/or the new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 4, 2008

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568